**Internettrust Foundation** 114-3755 West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue Vancouver, British Columbia V6R 1T9 Canada

September 14, 2006

Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr. United States District Court for the District of Delaware Federal Building, Room 4209 844 King Street Wilmington, DE 19801

> Re: Secureworks v. Internettrust Foundation 05-CV-538 JJF

#### Dear Judge Farnan:

This letter is being sent pursuant to discussions between the parties on the Plaintiff's pending Motion for Contempt. The parties have agreed to extend the time for response to Plaintiff's motion by one week, until September 25, 2006, so as to permit settlement discussions between the parties. I have attached an email from Mr. Keith Sharkin. counsel for the Plaintiff, confirming this agreement, and requesting that I contact the Court.

The Defendant does not have local counsel in Delaware, or in the United States. The previous deadline to obtain local counsel was set before this action was settled between the parties. As the action was settled by consent, the Defendant did not need to obtain local counsel in this action prior to its resolution.

In the event that the parties can not reach settlement by September 25, 2006, the Defendant will need time to retain and instruct local counsel to respond to Plaintiff's motion.

The Plaintiff's Notice pursuant to Local Rule 7.1.1 was not sent to the address of the Defendant as specified in the Settlement Agreement between the parties for all notices and correspondence relating to the agreement. As such, the first notice I had of Plaintiff's motion was when I received a copy sent to Defendant's address on September 5, 2006. I immediately contacted Mr. Sharkin upon receiving Plaintiff's motion, and I have continued to make good faith efforts to settle the outstanding issues without the need to proceed on Plaintiff's motion.

In the event that the parties can not reach settlement by September 25, 2006 I will write as soon as possible before this expiration date to address the issues of non-compliance with Local Rule 7.1.1 and obtaining local counsel for Defendant.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adam Joseph Ezer

President



### Adam Ezer <adamezer@gmail.com>

# **Motion for Contempt**

1 message

## Sharkin, Keith < KSharkin@kslaw.com>

Wed, Sep 13, 2006 at 1:39

PN

To: Adam Ezer <adamezer@gmail.com>

Cc: "Wasserman, Jill" <JWasserman@kslaw.com>, "Horwitz, Richard L."

<rhorwitz@potteranderson.com>

Adam: This e-mail will confirm our telephone conversation of today in which plaintiff agreed to a one week extension of time for defendant to respond to the motion for contempt while the parties attempt to resolve the matter. Defendant's response would now be due on September 25, 2006. Please contact the court. Keith

### Confidentiality Notice

This message is being sent by or on behalf of a lawyer. It is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete all copies of the message.